



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,937	06/08/2004	Hsin-Hsien Yu	ACMP0069USA	3936
27765	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			KHAN, SUHAIL	
P.O. BOX 506			ART UNIT	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PAPER NUMBER	
			2686	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/709,937	YU, HSIN-HSIEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suhail Khan	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 6 and 11-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6754470 to Hendrickson et al.

Referring to **claim 1**, Lin et al disclose a method for controlling a cellular phone (col 14, lines 48-52, control processes, wireless device; col 7, lines 36-38, mobile telephone handsets), the cellular phone comprising a memory (col 7, lines 60-65, memory) and a clock (col 25, line 37-42, device clock), the method comprising: (a) storing a time and a content of work executed at the time into the memory (col 4, lines 40-47, data gathering for collecting device parametric data and time stamp data; col 7, lines 60-65, information collected may be stored on the device's volatile and/or non-volatile memory); (b) taking statistics of each time of the work (col 4, lines 40-47, device parametric data and time stamp data); and (c) controlling the cellular phone according to the statistics and the time counted by the clock (col 14, lines 48-55, control center manages the quality control processes of the data from each wireless device as well as the overall administration of the network; also, col 3, lines 55-65, control settings; (col 4, lines 40-47, device parametric data and time stamp data).

Referring to **claim 2**, Lin et al disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the content of work comprises turning on the cellular phone, turning off the cellular phone, dialing, sending messages, browsing homepages, downloading data from homepages, and showing remaining power of the cellular phone (col 10, lines 20-35, applications, internet browsing activity, voice and data call, messaging, power).

Referring to **claim 6**, Lin et al disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) is to control the cellular phone to generate a message according to the statistics and the time counted by the clock (col 20, lines 31-37, gathered data is sent to the control center, data is interpreted as being the message).

Referring to **claim 11**, Lin et al disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) is to control the cellular phone when the clock of the cellular phone reaches the statistics on the time obtained in step (b) (col 14, lines 48-55, control center manages the quality control processes of the data from each wireless device as well as the overall administration of the network; also, col 3, lines 55-65, control settings; col 4, lines 40-47, device parametric data and time stamp data).

Referring to **claim 12**, Lin et al disclose a cellular phone for implementing the method of claim 1 (col 7, lines 36-38, mobile telephone handsets).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2686

4. Claims 3-5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6754470 to Hendrickson et al in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0065117 to Suda.

Referring to **claim 3**, Hendrickson et al disclose the method of claim 1 which includes storing a time and a content of work executed into the memory (col 4, lines 40-47, data gathering for collecting device parametric data and time stamp data; col 7, lines 60-65, information collected may be stored on the device's volatile and/or non-volatile memory). Hendrickson et al do not disclose stopping storing the time and the content of work executed at the time into the memory. The examiner maintains that the concept of stopping storing the time and the content of work executed at the time into the memory was well known in the art as taught by Suda.

In a similar field of endeavor, Suda shows providing a stop instruction (page 1, paragraph 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show stopping storing the time and the content of work executed at the time into the memory, as taught by Suda, the motivation being power control (Suda, page 2, paragraph 18).

Referring to **claim 4**, Hendrickson et al disclose the method of claim 1 which includes collecting data (col 4, lines 40-47, data gathering for collecting device parametric data and time stamp data; col 7, lines 60-65, information collected may be stored on the device's volatile and/or non-volatile memory). Hendrickson et al do not disclose stopping taking the statistics of each time of work. The examiner maintains that the concept of stopping taking the statistics of each time of work was well known in the art as taught by Suda.

In a similar field of endeavor, Suda shows providing a stop instruction (page 1, paragraph 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show stopping taking the statistics of each time of work, as taught by Suda, the motivation being power control (Suda, page 2, paragraph 18).

Referring to **claim 5**, Hendrickson et al disclose the method of claim 1 which includes collecting data (col 4, lines 40-47, data gathering for collecting device parametric data and time stamp data; col 7, lines 60-65, information collected may be stored on the device's volatile and/or non-volatile memory). Hendrickson et al do not disclose stopping controlling the cellular phone according to the statistics and the time counted by the clock.

In a similar field of endeavor, Suda shows providing a stop instruction (page 1, paragraph 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show stopping controlling the cellular phone according to the statistics and the time counted by the clock, as taught by Suda, the motivation being power control (Suda, page 2, paragraph 18).

5. Claims 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6754470 to Hendrickson et al. in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0032020 to Brown et al.

Referring to **claim 7**, Hendrickson et al. disclose the method of claim 6 (col 20, lines 31-37, gathered data is sent to the control center, data is interpreted as being the message). Hendrickson et al. do not disclose that the message is a ringing tone. The examiner maintains

Art Unit: 2686

that the concept of the message being a ring tone was well known in the art as taught by Brown et al.

In a similar field of endeavor, Brown et al show rings, tones (page 1, paragraph 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show that the message is a ringing tone, as taught by Brown et al, the motivation being different alerting methods (page 2, paragraph 11).

Referring to **claim 8**, Hendrickson et al. disclose the method of claim 6 (col 20, lines 31-37, gathered data is sent to the control center, data is interpreted as being the message). Hendrickson et al. do not disclose that the message is a text message. The examiner maintains that the concept of the message being a text message was well known in the art as taught by Brown et al.

In a similar field of endeavor, Brown et al show text messages (page 1, paragraph 5)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show that the message is a text message, as taught by Brown et al, the motivation being different alerting methods (Brown et al, page 2, paragraph 11).

Referring to **claim 9**, Hendrickson et al. disclose the method of claim 6. Hendrickson et al. do not disclose that the message is vibration. The examiner maintains that the concept of the message being vibration was well known in the art as taught by Brown et al.

In a similar field of endeavor, Brown et al show vibration (Brown et al, page 1, paragraph 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show that the message is a vibration, as taught by Brown et al, the motivation being different alerting methods (Brown et al, page 2, paragraph 11).

6. Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6754470 to Hendrickson et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6141563 to Miller et al.

Referring to **claim 10**, Hendrickson et al disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising: obtaining statistics on the time and the content of work (col 4, lines 40-47, data gathering for collecting device parametric data and time stamp data; statistics can be obtained at different instances and hence compared) and entering a password (col 11, lines 40-44). Hendrickson et al do not disclose that after a password of the cellular phone is changed for a period of time, comparing each time and content of work after the password was changed with the statistics on the time and the content of work before the password was changed; and if the time and the content of work before the password was changed; and if the time and the content of work after the password was changed do not substantially match the statistics on the time and the content of work before the password was changed, generating a message according to a call-out record of the cellular phone before the password was changed. The examiner maintains that the concept that after a password of the cellular phone is changed for a period of time, comparing each time and content of work after the password was changed with the statistics on the time and the content of work before the password was changed; and if the time and the content of work before the password was changed; and if the time and the content of work after the password was changed do not substantially match the statistics on the time and the content of work before the

Art Unit: 2686

password was changed, generating a message according to a call-out record of the cellular phone before the password was changed, was well known in the art as taught by Miller et al.

In a similar field of endeavor, Miller et al show changing the subscriber unit password (col 4, lines 53-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrickson et al to show after a password of the cellular phone is changed for a period of time, comparing each time and content of work after the password was changed with the statistics on the time and the content of work before the password was changed; and if the time and the content of work before the password was changed; and if the time and the content of work after the password was changed do not substantially match the statistics on the time and the content of work before the password was changed, as taught by Miller et al., the motivation being decreasing theft and misappropriation of subscriber units (Miller et al, col 1, lines 45-50).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patent is cited to further show the state of the art with respect to Monitoring Cellular Phone Activity.

U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0025795 to Sharon et al.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suhail Khan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 am to 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the

Art Unit: 2686

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold, can be reached at (571) 272-7905.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sk

Marsha D. Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600